



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PEACE IN ROME.

REV. S. L. BEILER, PH. D.

The Third International Peace Congress is just closing its session in this famous city where the olive branches wave in every breeze. The war-clouds hanging over South America, Asia and Europe; the ever-growing armaments of the great powers of this Continent; and the late intense excitement in Rome itself over the offensive acts of the French pilgrims at the grave of Victor Emanuel, have given the body sufficient reason for its existence, as well as grave anxiety. The Congress is made up of about three hundred representatives from eighty-eight societies in seventeen nations. It is quite remarkable in its personnel, from the aged, literary deputy, Signor Bonghi, who presides, to the bright and eloquent young men who occasionally lift their audience to a great pitch of excitement. Ladies, too, are present and influential; the Baroness von Suttner, of Austria, the Harriet Beecher Stowe of the peace movement, being one of the vice-presidents. Among those known to Americans who are active and potential are Rev. R. B. Howard, of the American Peace Society; Mr. W. W. Story, the well-known artist; Dr. Duncan, of the Congregational Sunday School Union; and Mr. Thomas Snape, one of the secretaries of the Methodist Ecumenical Conference.

It has become more and more evident daily that

MANY MOTIVES

are moving these earnest and vigorous men and women to combined action. Here is the Christian, who is moved by love of God and man, and feels that universal peace can only come through the highest Christianization of the nations. Here is the humanitarian, who is impelled by the shrinking of his sensitive nature from the horrors of war, and for the comfort of his fellows and himself is seeking the blessings of peace. Here are the political economist and capitalist, who see that war, preparations for war, the very existence of great armies and navies, means heavier taxation than that which is now almost crushing European peoples, and they seek relief through the Peace Congress. Here, too, is the Socialist—as an agnostic caring little for the Christian motive; as a battler for bread thinking less of the humanitarian's sentiment; as a laborer having no sympathy with the capitalist's grievances—eager for peace, disarmament, and especially arbitration, as sources of cure for many of his woes. With these and many other less pronounced diverse elements in the body, it has been no easy task to so conduct discussions in different tongues, and so frame resolutions in different languages, as not to engender strife rather than make for peace.

ARBITRATION

is also a favorite word, and Mr. Story's presentation of the scheme among the American republics was enthusiastically received and its adoption by all nations favored; but when the question came of pledging the Congress to a world-wide agitation in favor of the arbitration of labor difficulties and inter-race conflicts in the same nation, it became necessary to modify the former to a simple request of the Parliaments to arrange for such a settlement of those difficulties; while the latter concerning inter-race conflicts was referred to the next Congress to meet in Berne in 1892. While closing words are being uttered, olive branches of peace are being distributed, that we may bear them from Rome to the various countries we represent.—*Zion's Herald.*

Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll!
Leave thy low-vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea.
—O. W. Holmes.

NEW ENGLAND TO OLD.

AN ELOQUENT ADDRESS BY HON. J. W. PATTERSON IN LONDON.

New Hampshire's Noted Orator Pleads for International Arbitration and Universal Peace at a Mass Meeting in the City Temple July 17, 1891.

The international council of Congregational churches in London held a meeting July 17, 1891, in the City Temple, to discuss the formation of a federation of English speaking people for international arbitration and universal peace. Rev. L. D. Bevan, D. D., of Melbourne presided and the first speaker was Rev. F. H. Stead, and the second Rev. Newman Hall. Hon. James W. Patterson of Hanover followed.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—The magnitude of this occasion has surprised my anticipation. A New Englander addressing for the first time an audience like this of Old Englanders and from a London platform, should have a large inheritance of English pluck if he would not realize something of the perturbation of the school-boy who essays his first oration. In discharging the duty assigned me, however, I am more disturbed with the consciousness that I can add nothing of thought or motive to what has been so happily and forcibly urged by the distinguished speakers who have preceded me. Much less can I hope to contribute any new argument to the rich and cogent literature which since the close of the Napoleonic wars has been given to the cause of peace. As delegates, we bear the credentials of no one of the numerous peace and arbitration associations of the world, nor are we the accredited agents of any congress or institute of international law but, moved by the same transcendent purpose, as members of an older and broader organization, which seeks the brotherhood of mankind, we speak for that peace which is “the ultimate condition of all progress in religion and civilization.”

As representatives of an influential branch of the church founded by the Divine Master, with whose advent came the prophetic announcement of “peace on earth and good will to man,” it would be an unpardonable breach of duty, if from both continents we did not utter an emphatic protest against that complex evil which gathers into itself all the separate elements of woe which have cursed our race.

The time seems propitious for a general movement upon the common enemy. An extraordinary event, of wide political import, has occurred the last year, the full significance of which thoughtful men are coming more and more to realize.

Delegates from all the principal governments of America met at Washington on the 2d of October, 1890, with the avowed purpose of repudiating the cruel and senseless practice of war, and of putting the republics of the West upon an effective basis of peace. This is a new departure certainly in politics, and, if successful, is destined to modify, if not to revolutionize, the foreign policy of

nations. The action of a continent means business and cannot be disregarded. Its effects upon the public mind at home are already important for it has led to a treaty between Brazil and the United States which promises greater intimacy and increased prosperity to both.

In the fifteenth century, Charles VII of France set up in a time of peace, a large military establishment, and all the governments of Europe were forced in self-defence to follow his example. This false and ruinous system has been perpetuated to our day. But the Western republics already sufficiently extended, have preferred the development of home resources to the acquisition of foreign, and believing the intelligence and character of their own people more essential to the strength and happiness of nations than the extension of civil jurisdiction, have never indulged in the fatal luxury of large standing armies.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.

The International American Conference, actuated by this enlightened and liberal spirit, adopted a model treaty of arbitration which provides for the peaceful settlement of all future negotiable disputes which may arise between the parties to the treaty.

"Believing," says the convention, "that war is the most cruel, the most fruitless, and the most dangerous expedient for the settlement of international differences;

"Recognizing that the growth of the moral principles which govern political societies has created an earnest desire in favor of an amicable adjustment of such differences;

"Animated by the conviction of the great moral and material benefits that peace offers to mankind, and trusting that the existing conditions of the respective nations are specially propitious for the adoption of arbitration as a substitute for armed struggles;

"And considering it their duty to lend their assent to the lofty principles of peace which the most enlightened public sentiment of the world approves," we "do solemnly recommend all the governments by which we are accredited to conclude a uniform treaty of arbitration."

With this impulse in our hearts and influenced solely by a desire to hasten the day when this movement shall be universal, we, as American Christians, have come to this land of our fathers, whence they drew the spirit of their liberties and their faith, to take counsel how best we may promote the cause of a permanent and universal peace among nations.

I deem it a special felicity that the highest legislative assemblies of the two governments under which most of us have the happiness to live, are on record in favor of the negotiation of a permanent treaty providing for the peaceful arbitration of all future contentions that may arise between the two great powers. Political morality has reached no loftier attainment than this; has left no record on legislative history more glorious or more enduring and we have a right to assume that the followers of the Prince of Peace in all their creeds, who speak our language, will press upon the public sentiment of their respective nations this most hopeful expression of ethical statesmanship in nineteen centuries of Christian teaching. The past is the pledge of future success in this line of patriotic duty. We can conceive of no questions more complex or involved than those which have already been settled in ways honorable to the wisdom and good faith of both governments, and that the able and distinguished ministers directing our foreign affairs may terminate all outstanding

disputes by methods as humane and just as the prayer of all good men, and I am confident the supreme wish of the people on both sides of the Atlantic.

Law has its origin in an intuitive moral sense and its ultimate sanction in our mental constitution which necessitates a consciousness of right and wrong and demands justice in the transactions of men, whether organized or unorganized. It is the universal conscience concreted into definite and intelligible forms, the principles of abstract justice formulated and applied to the conduct of individuals and states in the intercourse of life. But the depraved conscience and feeble understanding of barbarous races can give no expression to this original spirit of law and, being slaves of passion and restrained by no sense of moral obligation, they take the redress of real or fancied wrongs into their own hands and battle to the death for revenge or to secure the objects of desire. This bloody animalism developed by degrees into the savage feuds of families, clans and tribes, and rose at last into the wars of nations which have desolated the earth and smitten its people with poverty, vice and crime.

Fortunately the progress of civilization relegated the vindication of personal rights to courts of law. Were it not so, life to a dense and intelligent population would be unendurable and suicide would be a relief from the horrid reality, even if it led to an existence as crowded with torments as Dante's Inferno.

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH REASON AND HUMANITY.

But by a strange inconsistency that defies reason and humanity, public war, which is a survival of the brutality and savagery of the primitive human animal, rioting in blood and slaughter, has been organized as a legitimate system and perpetuated in the policy of civilized and nominally Christian nations.

"For empire and greatness," says my Lord Bacon, "it importeth most that a nation do profess arms as their principal power, study and occupation." This voices the spirit of conquest and absolutism, whose dazzling exponents have written their names in blood and paved their way to power through desolated homes and the wrecks of civilization. And the statecraft of the nineteenth century still cherishes this demon of desolation twined with the plague as an ordained scourge of an angry God.

From three to five millions of strong men are withdrawn from the fields of industry, bedecked with expensive trappings and simulated honors, and trained like a pack of bloodhounds to be let loose at pleasure, upon their fellowmen; fair women are unsexed and forced to the coarse and unnatural work of men; millions of resources, created by the cruel toil of slaving myriads, are diverted from legitimate, productive investments and squandered on needless equipments of war; streets and almshouses are crowded with beggars and the people for whose welfare governments are instituted among men, starve and suffer, plot and rebel against a political system which, in the interest of humanity and good order, is compelled to crush these factious "mudsills," as they have been contemptuously styled, by a force made possible only by excessive taxation.

No man bows with a profounder respect than I to the guardians of liberty, justice and good order; no man would pay more costly honors to the defenders of their country or dedicate more lasting memorials to their fame, but I have only contempt for the great military peace establishments which lift brute courage to the place of

moral heroism; that depress and degrade the multitude that a few accidentally exalted, whose mental power and moral character could win no real distinction, may play the soldier and strut in artificial honors.

WAR INCONSISTENT WITH CHRISTIANITY.

The divine philosophy is that nations shall not "learn war any more." This is the burden of the message of the incarnate Son of God. Disarmament is the logical sequence to the teaching of both natural and revealed religion and should be the purpose of the most advanced statesmanship of this Christian age. But disarmament is impossible if not general. No single nation can surrender the means of self-defence so long as its neighbors retain power to crush it. To do so would be neither safe nor expedient. And from this the inference is drawn that great historic nations, like the somnambulist awakened at a moment of peril, must stand paralyzed and helpless awaiting the fatal plunge. The fiend of desolation is in possession and is master of the situation. Neither the genius of politics nor the spirit of Christianity can cast him out. This kind goeth not out by prayer and fasting, and civil progress must stagnate in this last retreat of the old school of conservative statesmanship. Any other theory, we are assured, is a transcendental dream impossible of realization.

Is not this a cowardly confession of weakness? Has not the statecraft of Europe advanced far enough to make possible a general treaty by which all international differences which cannot be adjusted by compromise or negotiation may be amicably settled by some form of arbitration?

"Nature gives us no right," says Vattel, "to have recourse to forcible means, except when gentle and pacific methods prove ineffectual." Such is the general teaching of those who have written on the law of nations. Now in the face of this, are we to be satisfied with the dictum that usage renders the law of God inoperative as between nations?

Alexander Hamilton said of the military peace establishments of Europe, that they were "engines of despotism which have been the scourge of the old world," and Madison admitted that the liberties of Rome proved the final victim to her military triumphs; and that the liberties of Europe, as far as they ever existed, have with few exceptions been the price of her military establishments. The burden and menace of a standing army are a perpetual provocation to revolutions in which the judgment of mankind must side with the oppressed.

Without a treaty of arbitration or a court of nations agreed upon by the leading powers, disciplined armies may be necessary in the present condition of Europe that she may escape the "chains of a universal monarch." But why not unite upon a treaty and throw off both the burden and the peril?

It is amazing that either the avarice or the ambition of the limited classes in the state should be able to hold the masses to the support of a system that is the source of their discontent and trouble. The plea that armies sequestered from the producers of society and fed like drones upon the fruits of its toil; that vast military supplies, impregnable forts and invincible navies are essential to government is a confession that the spirit of conquest still dominates the policy of nations and that a purpose of aggrandizement by violence and spoliation is yet the controlling genius of public law. But is the

lust of empire or the desire to perpetuate personal pomp and power the controlling motive of governments that recognize the validity of popular rights? Is the acquisition of territory more or less? Is any commercial or political advantage secured by violence or cunning in the arrangement of national contentions paramount to a prosperous industry or a compensation for the cost and horrors of war waged by the destructive enginery of modern times? Is the waste of millions of capital that might duplicate production by utilizing the discoveries and the improvements of the age: that might support innumerable institutions of learning and religion and so give to states the influence and prestige of an educated Christian people, either wise or politic?

STANDING ARMIES.

Laws and policies of government, in our time, must keep pace with the rapid changes in the intelligence and business activities of the world, or they will lose their grip upon its populations. Patriotism and loyalty do not long survive the disregard of material and social interests by the civil power. But we are reminded that the balance of power must be maintained. Yes, but must it be maintained by the only force that threatens its existence?

I have no feelings but those of impartial kindness and good-will to the peoples and the institutions of Europe, but you will pardon me, I am sure, if I speak frankly and earnestly from the standpoint of an American, as I can speak from no other.

Why, then, let me ask, should governments be impoverished and peoples oppressed to maintain a system that is a constant menace to the peace of nations? If all the forts of Europe were dismantled, her armies disbanded, and her proud navies devoted to commerce, would the peace of the world be less secure or its prosperity less certain than now?

Political institutions are organized to protect the interests and to secure the material, intellectual and moral well-being of society, and when they fail to do this, the right of revolution becomes imminent. If the existing status of a community of nations subserves these high and holy ends of the civil polity, it should be maintained, but if not it should fall. Governments are made for men (I do not say for a restless, unthinking, unprincipled faction), not men for governments, and hence misrule can claim no right of perpetual existence. It would be as legitimate for a race of savages to shut off all intercourse in an age of universal commerce and exclude the reign of law and the influences of civilization from the fairest quarter of the globe on the plea of prior occupation, as to defend a government that disregards the material and moral welfare of its subjects in the administration of power.

To-day the people are the supreme power of the state and their patriotism draws its inspiration from their intelligence. Military glory, a splendid equipage and official eclat, they are no longer willing to accept as a substitute for successful industries, educational privileges, social comforts and happy homes. They have outgrown the serfdom of feudalism and will not follow blindly the standard of any master. The government that in good faith shapes its policy in their interests, will have their confidence and unlimited support. But they are not easily deceived by gewgaws however gilded. If their will is persistently disregarded they will sooner or

later organize and sweep away, it may be with a blind and relentless fury, the power that clings to old abuses. If the present balance of power in Europe is deemed beneficial by the disinterested intelligence of its best classes, the people will support their statesmen in a great effort to put its continuance upon a stable basis of peace.

If the leaders who mould the civil affairs of the continent including Russia would follow Wolsey's advice and "fling away ambition," if they would consummate an honest treaty of arbitration and reduce their great armies to the measure of an efficient police for the control of their own people, aggressions would cease and offensive wars would become rare and feeble. It is high time that nations should banish the political machinery of the dark ages to the limbo of the dead despots and devote themselves wisely to the welfare of those in whose will, under God, "they move and have their being." The lust of power and the greed of fame that seek their ends in the sack of cities and the brutal encounters of battle; that delay the coming of the peace of prophecy, should have no standing to-day in the court of nations.

We are prone to measure our rights by our apparent interests, and surrender to adroit demagogues the power to so manipulate public opinion as to generate a storm of popular passion which in its terrific march may sweep down justice and bury, in its blind progress, the glorious fruitage of centuries of enlightened sentiment and toil. But when the reign of reason is restored we learn that a state policy which disregards the dictates of justice and substitutes might for right in the settlement of international disputes, degrades the national character and jeopardizes the retention of power by violating the public opinion and sacrificing the moral sanction of mankind.

When the rights of citizens are outraged by a foreign power and the demand for reparation is refused; when proffers of peaceful adjustment of conflicting claims are rejected; when the honor and safety of the state are imperilled; when justice and humanity are spurned and unreasonable demands pressed with threats of violence, then it becomes the duty of the state to assert its rights by the use of power.

But a binding treaty of arbitration, ratified by any respectable number of independent governments, would render the conditions of justifiable war between them very rare if not impossible. To secure this then is the splendid function of the pure and disciplined statesmanship of this Christian era. But in pleading for the peaceful settlement of international controversies we must not ask for the impossible. The municipal law of each state advances with the intellectual and moral growth of the people and takes an impress from their characteristics and conditions. Thus the civil law is instinct with the spirit of the Roman people and the common law is characterized by the strong practical sense and moral instincts of English society.

But the historic development of public law has been retarded by the varying degrees of civilization and spiritual advancement and by the conflicting ambitions of the whole community of political organizations.

A common definition of conduct is made possible by a universal sense of justice. We cannot analyze this sense for it lies back of reason and defies our utmost scrutiny. It is a revelation to the soul and is the unimpeachable foundation of the entire superstructure of law. This is the law written on the heart which all men, not depraved

by habits of evil doing, recognize as the divine standard of human action, and it applies with a force as imperative to the intercourse of states as of individuals. "The just state," says Plato, "differs in no respect from the just man," and Grotius maintains that the ethical principle should underlie all transactions between states as between individuals. All nations appeal to public opinion, which is only an expression of the generalized conscience of mankind, in justification of their acts. The *de jure* validity of moral principles, as applied to the conduct of nations, has been universally recognized and has been as universally disregarded *de facto*. The ethical principle applied to disputed interests of individuals has transferred them from the arbitrament of violence to the arbitrament of courts.

In the mutual conduct of states it has been far otherwise. In the earlier historic periods when the exchanges of nations were rare and their common interests were few, conquests and spoliation were the rule and wars were perpetual. In this slough of ignorance and selfishness, public law, such as it was, floundered and stagnated. But with the fall of the Roman Empire and the decline of feudalism, the spirit of trade which impelled to a general intercourse by sea and land, necessitated a broader application and a more lucid definition of the law of nations. Life began to stir at length under the ribs of death and since then the growth has been steady. But as improvement in the unwritten law that applies to the rights and duties of nations must come by the general consensus of peoples whose intelligence and moral perceptions are differentiated by their varied conditions and at different periods of their history, it must advance slowly by treaties, customs and decisions of courts to the philosophic standard conceived by the great writers in the realm of abstract thought.

At intervals men of extraordinary gifts and with special aptitudes for generalization have gathered up the confused ideas of jural principles floating in the minds of civilians and reduced them to a system which might apply to the foreign affairs of states. These have not, of course, the authority of legislation, but so far as accepted they are the law of nations. This organic embodiment of principles is improving year by year and slowly substituting for the practice of artifice, dissimulation, and corruption as taught by the Machiavelian school of diplomacy, a recognized code of international jurisprudence.

The formal agreement by treaty of the principal enlightened states of the world, to submit their mutual differences to adjudication by a law of nations, will be an abandonment of the old system of fraud and force hitherto potential, and an acceptance of the dicta of righteousness as the supreme law in the conduct of states as of individuals. This epoch will mark the grandest triumph which Christian ethics has reached in its victorious march.

A formal code bringing the intercourse of governments in all matters negotiable to the theory of abstract justice, we are told by practical politicians is an impossible aspiration or dream of learned publicists and jurists. May we not rather say it is a glorious prophecy of that which is yet to be? It is certainly the goal and resting place toward which our present imperfect and ill-defined system is slowly approximating through conventions, mediations, compromises and arbitrations. Each case settled helps to determine the principles applicable to all cases. In

law as in other things the real finds a stable foundation only in the ideal. Should some future congress of nations adopt such a code it would necessarily have its limitations.

ARBITRATION

Independence, sovereignty and political equality are essential to nations and can be submitted to no form of litigation. We must concede as a condition precedent to any plan for the amicable arrangement for controversies, the right of self-defence when assailed and the duty of protecting the rights and lives of citizens by force if we must. These are natural and inalienable rights of men, and remain to them when organized into governments. Slavery and the debasement of national character are worse than war and must be resisted by all the might of popular power.

But the multitude of questions that may arise from commercial and diplomatic relations from immigration and travel; the intricate disputes in respect to expatriation and extradition, neutral rights on land and sea, the property rights and legal obligations of foreigners and sojourners, the delimitation of boundaries, the conduct of belligerents and neutrals in time of war, the exemption of the persons and property of non-combatants from the ravages of war, the doctrine of "free ships, free goods," and "enemies' ships, enemies' goods,"—these and many more, which have been the occasions of desolating conflicts in the past, should be settled by arbitration or in a court of nations. More than seventy disputed cases, and many of them of the most vexed and irritating nature, have already been successfully arbitrated. Why may not the number be increased to "seventy times seven" in the spirit of our divine Master whose teachings have been revolutionizing the policy of governments for eighteen hundred years? Why may not all disputes be arbitrated in the same spirit? A mixed court was established by a treaty between England and the United States in 1862 to adjudicate upon captured slaves. Why not by the same authority establish a court for the adjudication of all controverted international interests as well, and why may not the principle be extended to other nations?

It has been urged that a law of nations was impossible as there is no common legislature to make, and no common superior to execute, an international code if made. Allow me to refer to my own government to enforce my position.

The republic consists of forty-four rich and populous states, independent and sovereign, except so far only as they have voluntarily vested sovereignty in the constitution for general purposes. With us all interstate controversies are litigated in the Supreme Court under the constitution and the laws made pursuant thereto, as peacefully as a suit at common law. Now have not the constitution and the Supreme Court to the members of the Union the force of a public code and court of nations? But they were created by the states themselves and their validity springs from the faith which each party to the Union has that the law will be honestly and efficiently executed. Here the code and the court were not the offspring of a common superior but of the parties whose suits are to be litigated.

Doubtless if each state maintained an "overgrown military establishment" such as Washington pronounced "inauspicious to liberty," the peace of the republic would be imperilled in spite of the constitution. The governments of continental Europe number less than

half the states of the Union and some of them are inferior in wealth and population to members of the republic. Why should not they reduce their grand armies to the proportion of an efficient police force and enter in good faith into a treaty of international arbitration? Why may not a community of nations adopt an adequate code of public laws prepared by a commission of learned jurists, and create a court of nations whose decisions shall be supreme and ultimate as readily as a confederacy of states? There is nothing in the nature of the scheme to render it impossible, for the history of my country through a century of unparalleled prosperity seems to have driven that objection into the cave of perpetual silence, and certainly the welfare of the masses is in the prevalence of peace.

Am I here reminded of our civil war? That suggestion has no force as an argument against my illustration, for our civil conflict did not spring from any ordinary friction between the states, but from an inherited antagonism in the body politic at its birth which nothing but the surgery of war could remove, and all sections to-day rejoice that it no longer threatens the paramount peace and welfare of the republic. The rapid and universal exchange of products and the wide-reaching travel that characterize our time will soon render a code of laws for the adjudication of disputed questions indispensable, if the wheels of trade are not to be clogged or the nations plunged into wars of unprecedented severity and extent. Scarcely a week now passes that does not raise some tangled issue from this vast net-work of trade. A wise statesmanship should provide against the evil day before it is too late.

A definite code would educate the business public as to the extent and limitations of its rights and duties, and so obviate many of the occasions of trouble which now perplex and hamper the freedom of intercourse. To know the wrong is the best way to avoid it.

War is a gigantic wrong to the material interests of nations but the corruption of manners, the loss of patriotism and of that desire for grand achievements which a great English poet styles "the last infirmity of noble minds," is worse. Providentially war, like other evils, may sometimes result in good. In an age of violence, by crushing a nest of petty tyrannies, it may arrest a carnival of blood and establish an orderly state on the wrecks of anarchy. It may kindle the sluggish manhood of the assailed and breathe a spirit of moral courage into a nation and so become the precursor of a nobler life. It may awaken the dormant heroism and inspire with a lofty purpose some unrecognized Sidney or Havelock; but in its essential nature it is devilish and cruel and its natural fruit is poverty, lust and crime.

Why should the day of promise delay? All disputes must be settled by arraignment at last. Why should homes be desolated, cities sacked, industries stagnated, resources annihilated, and lives sacrificed to petty interests or a mistaken sense of honor that leaders may be brought to a work of practical statecraft? Should any ordinary commercial or political advantages stand in the way of adjustment? Can they compensate for the sacrifices, the crimes and the miseries inflicted upon a people by the scourge of war? Are not the intellectual deterioration, the moral corruption, the dehumanizing of the sensibilities and the retrogression of civilization, which follow the footsteps of battle, to enter as motives in determining the international policy of nations? The

blood of Abel cried to God from the ground. How deep and long has been the cry that has gone up to heaven from the red fields of carnage that have marked the historic path of nations? The ambition for power and military glory delays the consummation of civil progress in which states shall conform their conduct to the moral judgment of mankind and to the ethical teachings of Christianity.

As we look forward, the splendors of that day of unbroken peace impress our imagination and we renew our faith in the speedy triumph of a renovated civilization. And it is well, for prophecy is not fulfilled by accident or indifference. The promises of God wait upon our inaction. The realization of our hopes will come by the increasing pressure of an educated and rectified public opinion. The advance to a new position must be made at the front. Nations slough the old husks of habit and thought in which they have grown up only when they are ripe for new conditions. The more backward and non-Christian nations will reject for a time the theory of arbitration, but the rapid exchange of ideas and customs is fast breaking down the distinctions of intelligence and a state will not long repudiate what the leading powers promulgate as the law of nations. They would be too weak to ravage the territory of their neighbors and the terrible penalty of non-intercourse in this period of universal commerce would soon bring them to the line of progress.

But the supreme duty in this great reform rests with the English-speaking people. Mighty victories have already been achieved by our statesmen in this campaign of peace which will be their enduring memorials in the temple of immortality. But the field is not secured. Let us insist that no question susceptible of accommodation shall ever again be submitted to fratricidal strife by the peoples who speak a common language, whose civilization rests upon a common inheritance of ideas and a common system of faith. There is a fascination in the thrilling historic records of battles and in the classic songs that rehearse the splendid achievements of the great military masters of the world, but the wisest of kings has said that "righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people."

The genius of literature has transformed the heroic crimes of an earlier age into dazzling virtues which pervert the judgments while they refine the tastes of scholars, but through eighteen stormy centuries, the voice of the carpenter's son, more sweet and more commanding, comes to us from out the shadow of the cross: "Put up again thy sword into his place."

The practical sense and active virtues of our race will not, cannot stagnate in this Serbonian bog, but casting off the shackles of ancient custom will go forward to the higher life and nobler victories waiting for us in the promises of revelation.

The great empire and the great republic of the English speaking people, standing on the advanced line of civilization, and reaching with paramount influence, by their laws and literature, so large a part of the population of the globe, owe to mankind a united and persistent effort to establish by precept and example the reign of peace among the nations of the earth. God has waited long for the realization of His promise, but His vengeance will not always slumber. Sooner or later justice will hew to the line of reason and "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

This council represents two nations, but one people; a

people whose brain and brawn have carried their power, their laws and their civilization to the ends of the earth; a people whose skill creates and supplies new wants; whose enterprise baffles opposition and whose influence would establish justice and humanity in the civil polity of nations.

Separated providentially into governments based upon the same political and ethical principles, this one people should have no ambitions or animosities that may hereafter disturb the reign of peace along their common borders or weaken their power for intellectual and moral achievements by needless apprehensions. The past of both nations is an enduring record of great and glorious deeds. That our increasing commerce and political influence may be controlled by the spirit of a yet broader and loftier political philosophy that so the statesmanship of the English speaking people may be recognized among all nations as potential for good, should be the prayer and effort of us all.

The old history of military glory is becoming dim in the light of a purer and grander civilization that is dawning upon the earth. Let us advance to the front of this age of Christian statecraft that we may win for our race the honors of a nobler immortality in the kingdom of righteousness. The ministers of our religion have raised the standard of the cross in all lands and under that banner they will conquer.

An irresistible force of moral sentiment has been gathering through the centuries that sooner or later will banish the barbarism of war from the political creed of nations. The divine purpose of "good will to man" underruns our schemes and drifts them into the ordained plan of human history. This is that,

"Mystery in the soul of state
Which hath an operation more divine
Than our mere Chroniclers dare meddle with."

MY BEST.

JULIA H. MAY.

My name is not upon the rolls of fame,
'Tis on the page of common life imprest;
But I'll keep marking, marking just the same,
And do my best.

Sometimes I sing a very simple song
And send it outward, to the east or west;
Although in silence it rolls along,
I do my best.

And if I see some fellow traveller rise
Far, far above me; still with quiet breast
I keep on climbing, climbing toward the skies,
And do my best.

My very best, and if, at close of day,
Worn out, I sit me down awhile to rest,
And I will mend my garments, if I may,
And do my best.

Better and better every stitch must be,
The last a little stronger than the rest,
Good Master! help my eyes, that they may see
To do my very best.

"An hour lost will get behind you and chase you forever."